

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/520,193	01/04/2005	Volker Schoellmann	NL 020621	7841	
24737	7590 11/16/2006		EXAMINER		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			SHALLENBER	SHALLENBERGER, JULIE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Diamicoli	Bidino Entrino 10, 101		2875		
		DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

34

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/520,193	SCHOELLMANN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Julie A. Shallenberger	2875			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE STATE OF THE MAILING DOWN THE STATE OF THE MAILING DOWN THE STATE OF THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING THE MAILI	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 Se	eptember 2006.				
<u> </u>					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.		•			
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9</u> is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 January 2005</u> is/are		to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: 1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior					
application from the International Bureau	•	e a manuel conserved			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		ed.			
Attachment(s)	·				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal P				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:				

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zhou (5,953,469).

In regard to claims 1 and 8, Zhou discloses a display device comprising a first light guide 20 (figure 3), a second light guide 40, a movable element 30 and selector means 71 and 72 the movable element 30 is arranged in between said light guides, and wherein said selector is arranged to locally bring the movable element into contact with a selected one of the light guides.

In regard to claims 2-4 Zhou teaches that said movable element is reflective (31 and col. 10, lines 31-35) or transparent (30c, 30d (col. 1 l, lines 20-21)). Zhou further discloses row and column electrode 22 and 23 (figure 5C).

In regard to claims 5 and 6, Zhou discloses LEDs as light-emitting means for emitting UV radiation (col. 16, lines 60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhou.

Zhou does not specifically teach that the light-emitting means are arranged to alternatively introduce into the first and second light guides. However Zhou discloses two light sources (60 and 66) disposed at opposite ends of a waveguide. Further he teaches other variations in light-coupling method are possible. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange Zhou's light-emitting means to alternatively introduce light into the first and second light guides because of Zhou's teachings above.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art fails to show or teach in combination the claimed display device configured to alternately introduce light into the first and second light guides.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/15/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments that Zhou failed to disclose individually, or suggest in combination, a second light guide and a selector configured to selectively bring movable element into contact with a selected once of the two waveguides, the applicant is respectfully advised that while the claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. In re American Academy of Science Tech Center, 70 USPQ2d 1827 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004). In this case, element 40 is a light guide because it is used to guide light through element 20. Furthermore, element 30 is movable toward light guide 20 for controlling the light emission (col. 4 lines 15-25). The movement is facilitated by the mechanical structures (seen in figure 8A, and explained in col. 11 line 47-col. 12 lines 9) as well as electrostatic forces (col. 7 lines 39-49). Since element 30 is movable, it would inherently have a selector to operate the movement via 71 and 72.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Baur (4,113,360) teaches a similar device with a movable part disposed between the two light guides.

Roest (6,396,637) teaches a similar device with light guides and a foil part.

Art Unit: 2875

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julie A. Shallenberger whose telephone number is (571)272-7131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 830-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Renee Luebke can be reached on 571-272-2009. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2875

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Julie Shallenberger Examiner AU 2875

> RENEE LOEBKE PRIMARY EXAMINER